

## NOT FOR PUBLICATION

**NOV 26 2007** 

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

## FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

JOSE JUAN RUEDAS BARAJAS,

Petitioner,

v.

MICHAEL B. MUKASEY, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 06-72189

Agency No. A78-661-815

MEMORANDUM\*

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted November 13, 2007\*\*

Before: TROTT, W. FLETCHER, and CALLAHAN, Circuit Judges.

<sup>\*</sup> This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

<sup>\*\*</sup> The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

Jose Juan Ruedas Barajas, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order denying his motion to reopen removal proceedings. We dismiss the petition for review.

The evidence Ruedas Barajas presented with his motion to reopen concerned the same basic hardship grounds as his application for cancellation of removal. *See Fernandez v. Gonzales*, 439 F.3d 592, 602-03 (9th Cir. 2006). We therefore lack jurisdiction to review the BIA's discretionary determination that the evidence was insufficient to establish a prima facie case of hardship. *See id.* at 601 (holding that if "the BIA determines that a motion to reopen proceedings in which there has already been an unreviewable discretionary determination concerning a statutory prerequisite to relief does not make out a prima facie case for that relief," 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(2)(B)(i) bars this court from revisiting the merits).

## PETITION FOR REVIEW DISMISSED.